

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant's attorneys respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the instant application in view of the above amendments and following remarks, which place the application into condition for allowance.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3 are pending in this application and are rejected in the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2006. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 are amended as outlined above. It is believed that no new subject matter has been introduced as a result of the claim amendments.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE ABSTRACT

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of a typographical error and failure to adhere to the single paragraph requirement of MPEP § 608.01(b). In response, the Abstract has been amended as outlined above to correct the minor typographical error and to place the Abstract in proper form. Accordingly, Applicant's attorneys respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

III. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserts that the term "generally using only for" in claim 1, line 10 and claim 2, line 3 is unclear. In response, as indicated above, the language in claims 1 and 2 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention. Specifically,

“generally using only for” has been amended to “generally used only for”. The term “generally used only for” denotes the diameter of the screw material generally used for only the first external thread. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 3, lines 14-16 of the Specification as originally filed. An example can also be found on page 5, lines 4-9, of the Specification as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant’s attorneys respectfully request that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn.

IV. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AND 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by published Japanese patent application JP 11-254072 to Katsuhiko *et al.* (“Katsuhiko”). In addition, claim 1 is rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,854,350 to Bauer *et al.* (“Bauer”). Lastly, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Katsuhiko in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,569,009 to Suzuki (“Suzuki”). These rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

Katsuhiko discloses to a method of rolling left- and right-hand threads simultaneously using a flat thread formed on a flat plate. Lacking in Katsuhiko is a discussion of the initial diameter of the screw material and the pitch of the resulting threads. As recited in revised claim 1, the instant invention is directed to a method for manufacturing a right- and left-screw having a first external thread and a second external thread formed reversely wherein the diameter of the screw material is less than the diameter of a screw material generally used for the first external thread. See also *Instant Application*, page 3, lines 14-15. An additional feature of the instant invention is a second external thread with a pitch smaller than the first external thread. *Id.* at page 2, lines 18-19. As presently understood, Katsuhiko fails to disclose these two aspects of the

instant invention. Accordingly, applicant's attorneys respectfully submit that Katsuhiro fails to teach the claimed invention.

The Office Action also rejects claim 1 under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bauer. The Bauer reference discloses simultaneously forming right-handed and left-handed threads on an external surface of a blank. Lacking in Bauer, however, is any teaching directed toward a diameter of the blank in comparison to the diameter generally used for the first external thread. As discussed above, the instant invention is directed to a method for manufacturing a right- and left-screw having a first external thread and a second external thread formed reversely wherein the diameter of the screw material is less than the diameter of a screw material generally used for the first external thread. Also absent from Bauer is any teaching as to the relationship between the pitch of the two formed threads. As noted above, the instant claims require a second external thread with a smaller pitch than the first external thread. Accordingly, applicant's attorneys respectfully submit that Bauer fails to teach or suggest the instantly claimed invention.

Lastly, claims 1-3 are rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Katsuhiro in view of Suzuki. As discussed above, the method taught in Katsuhiro fails to disclose the use of a screw material with a diameter less than the diameter of a screw material generally used for the first external thread. Katsuhiro also fails to disclose any relationship between the pitch of the first external thread and the second external thread.

Suzuki fails to correct the deficiencies of Katsuhiro. As presently understood, Suzuki discloses a screw with two threads of the same hand, either both right-handed or both left-handed. Pitch is discussed only to indicate that there is a difference between the pitch of the main thread and that of the sub-thread. Further, only the final outer diameters of the main thread and sub-thread are mentioned to indicate that the diameter of the main thread is greater than that

of the sub-thread." Discussion of the initial diameter of the screw material is also lacking in Suzuki. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Katsuhiro and Suzuki would not result in the presently claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant's attorneys respectfully submit that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of Katsuhiro, Bauer, and Suzuki, either alone or in combination, and is therefore. Further, claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are allowable as well.

The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, several documents. The Applicant's attorneys appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present invention unpatentable.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: Anthony D. Mustillo
Matthew K. Ryan
Reg. No. 30,800

Anthony D. Mustillo
Reg. No. 58,836

Telephone: (212) 588-0800
Facsimile: (212) 588-0500